

### **REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated February 7, 2006, the Applicants have amended claims 1, 13, 24, and 35. Claims 1-45 are in the case. Reexamination and

The Office Action rejected claims 1-12 and 24-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crawford (U.S. Patent No. 5,771,354) in view of Merrel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,553,408 B1). The Office Action rejected claims 13-23 and 35-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crawford and Merrel et al. in view of Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 5,736,982).

The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the amendments to the claims and the arguments below.

The Applicants' amended claims now include automatically providing to a user updated documentation about, and updated services available for, the physical device through the virtual device. Support for the amendments can be found in at least paragraphs [0018] – [0020] and FIGS. 1-4 of U.S. Patent Publication Serial No. 2003/0120718 A1. For example, "...A user does not need to seek out a written document, which may have become misplaced or lost, in order to seek or update the services available to the physical device." In addition, the "...physical device may use the URI to communicate with the associated device avatar to obtain services." (see paragraph [0019] and FIGS 1 and 2 of the Applicants' published patent application).

In contrast, Crawford in combination with Merrel et al. do not disclose, teach, or suggest the Applicants' automatically providing to a user updated documentation about, and updated services available for, the physical device through the virtual device. Instead, the combined references merely disclose an Internet service that allows a user to register for online storage resources (see Abstract of Crawford) and a storage server and data processing resources for storing lists of driver modules (see Abstract of Merrel et al.).

Although the combined references disclose linking physical devices with virtual devices (Crawford) and memory for storing lists of driver modules (Merrel et al.), the combination of Crawford with Merrel et al. is still missing the Applicants' automatically

Serial No.: 10/029,338  
Attorney Docket No.: 10013492-1

providing to a user **updated documentation** about, and **updated services available** for, the physical device.

This **failure** of the cited references, in combination or alone, to disclose, suggest or provide motivation for the Applicant's claimed invention indicates a lack of a prima facie case of obviousness (MPEP 2143).


With regard to the rejection of the dependent claims, because they depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, and they contain additional limitations that are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, these claims are also considered to be patentable (MPEP § 2143.03).

Thus, it is respectfully requested that all of the claims be allowed based on the amendments and arguments. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicants kindly **request** the Examiner to telephone the Applicants' attorney at **(818) 885-1575**.

Please note that all mail correspondence should continue to be directed to

Hewlett Packard Company  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,  
Dated: May 8, 2006



Edmond A. DeFrank  
Reg. No. 37,814  
Attorney for Applicants  
(818) 885-1575 TEL  
(818) 885-5750 FAX